

REMARKS

Claim 1 and 6 are rejected under 35USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Menceles (US Patent 6,622,867). Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Menceles (US 6,622,867) in view of Gaulkin et al (US 5,403,223). Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 3 through 5 are objected to for dependence upon a rejected base claim but indicated to be allowable if amended to include the limitations of base and intervening claims. The drawings are accepted.

Claim 1 has been amended to combine the limitations of claims 1 and 3. Claim 3 has been cancelled in favor of the amendment of claim 1 and the dependence of claim 4 has been shifted from claim 3 to claim 1. Claim 8 has been amended to meet rejection under 35USC 112.


With respect to rejection of claims 1 and 6 under 35USC 102(e) based upon Menceles, it is believed that Applicant's amendment of claim 1 to include the limitations of claims 3 (mirror cover) clearly distinguishes claim 1 (and by dependence) claim 6 from Menceles. Menceles fails to show Applicant's mirror cover.

Similarly, with respect to rejection of claims 2 and 8 under 35USC 103(a) based upon Menceles in view of Gaulkin et al, it is believed that Applicant's amended claim 1 (and by dependence claims 2 and 8) set forth non obvious structure. Specifically, neither Menceles nor

Gaulkin et al alone or in combination provides the claimed combination package having Applicant's mirror cover.

Finally, it is believed that claims 7 and 8 as amended are clear. Claim 7 sets forth a "mirror cover" while claim 8 as amended sets forth a "mirror wall". These elements are not inclusive but are readily distinguishable. With referenced to Applicant's Figure 5, the mirror cover is element 55 while the mirror wall is mirror 16.

Respectfully Submitted,



Roy A. Ekstrand
Registration No. 27,485
Attorney for the Applicant